

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite due to an inconsistency in the recitation of the two voltage signals. In response, it is noted that the Examiner's interpretation of the claims is correct, and claims 4 and 5 have been amended accordingly to correct this point of indefiniteness. It is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 5, as herewith amended, now fully comply with the requirements of §112.

On the merits, claims 1-5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shieh, with claim 6 being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shieh in view of Katase, all for the reasons of record. In response, independent claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims, as well as the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

More specifically, the independent claims, as herewith amended, now more precisely recite that a control signal (CG) is applied to the voltage level generator to indicate which one of the plurality of different voltage levels has to be applied to the

associated one of the pixels. This subject matter is clearly supported by the instant disclosure in the paragraph spanning pages 4 and 5, wherein it is clearly stated that the voltage level generator 5 receives the control signal CG to supply the appropriate voltage level VBi of the voltage signal VB. Additionally, this recitation is supported by Fig.1 of the drawing, wherein a control signal CG is applied to voltage level generator 5, which in turn provides the output VB to the pixels.

It is respectfully submitted that this more precise and accurate structural recitation is neither shown nor suggested in the cited and applied references, which are suggested in the Action to merely show a control driver for supplying control signals to the control electrodes, which is respectfully submitted to be a substantially different teaching.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims, as herewith amended, now fully comply with the requirements of §112 and define an invention which is clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied

references. Accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531
(914) 333-96330